CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP

STUART W. GOLD JOHN W. WHITE EVAN R. CHESLER MICHAEL L. SCHLER RICHARD LEVIN KRIS F. HEINZELMAN B. ROBBINS KIESSLING ROGER D. TURNER PHILIP A. GELSTON RORY O. MILLSON FRANCIS P. BARRON RICHARD W. CLARY WILLIAM P. ROGERS, JR. JAMES D. COOPER STEPHEN L. GORDON DANIEL L. MOSLEY JAMES C. VARDELL, III ROBERT H. BARON KEVIN J. GREHAN C. ALLEN PARKER MARC S. ROSENBERG SUSAN WEBSTER DAVID MERCADO ROWAN D. WILSON CHRISTINE A. VARNEY

SANDRA C. GOLDSTEIN THOMAS G. RAFFERTY MICHAEL S. GOLDMAN RICHARD HALL JULIE A. NORTH ANDREW W. NEEDHAM STEPHEN L. BURNS KEITH R. HUMMEL DANIEL SLIFKIN ROBERT I. TOWNSEND, III WILLIAM J. WHELAN, III SCOTT A. BARSHAY PHILIP J. BOECKMAN ROGER G. BROOKS WILLIAM V. FOGG FAIZA J. SAEED RICHARD J. STARK THOMAS E. DUNN MARK I. GREENE DAVID R. MARRIOTT MICHAEL A. PASKIN ANDREW J. PITTS MICHAEL T. REYNOLDS

Worldwide Plaza 825 Eighth Avenue New York, NY 10019-7475

TELEPHONE: (212) 474-1000 FACSIMILE: (212) 474-3700

CITYPOINT
ONE ROPEMAKER STREET
LONDON ECZY 9HR
TELEPHONE: 44-20-7453-1000
FACSIMILE: 44-20-7860-1150

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

(212) 474-1772

GEORGE E, ZOBITZ GEORGE A. STEPHANAKIS DARIN P. MCATEE GARY A. BORNSTEIN TIMOTHY G. CAMERON KARIN A. DEMASI LIZABETHANN R. EISEN DAVID'S FINKFISTEIN DAVID GREENWALD RACHEL G. SKAISTIS PAUL H. ZUMBRO JOEL F. HEROLD ERIC W. HILFERS GEORGE F. SCHOEN ERIK R. TAVZEL CRAIG F. ARCELLA TEENA-ANN V. SANKOORIKAL ANDREW R. THOMPSON DAMIEN R. ZOUBEK TATIANA LAPUSHCHIK ERIC L. SCHIELE ALYSSA K. CAPLES JENNIFER S. CONWAY

MINH VAN NGO
KEVIN J. ORSINI
MATTHEW MORREALE
JOHN D. BURETTA
J. WESLEY EARNHARDT
YONATAN EVEN
BENJAMIN GRUENSTEIN
JOSEPH D. ZAVAGLIA
STEPHEN M. KESSING
LAUREN A. MOSKOWITZ
DAVID J. PERKINS
JOHNNY G. SKUMPIJA
J. LEONARD TETI, II

SPECIAL COUNSEL
SAMUEL C. BUTLER
GEORGE J. GILLESPIE, III

OF COUNSEL
PAUL C. SAUNDERS

November 13, 2013

In re South African Apartheid Litigation 02 MDL 1499 (SAS)

Dear Judge Scheindlin:

We represent IBM in the above-captioned matter. We submit this letter on behalf of IBM and Ford Motor Company (collectively, "defendants") to advise the Court that on November 7, 2013, the Second Circuit issued an order (attached hereto) denying plaintiffs' petition for panel rehearing and rehearing en banc. In light of the denial of rehearing and of the guidance this Court provided at the September 24, 2013, pre-motion conference, defendants respectfully request that the Court enter judgment in their favor.

Defendants maintain that judgment in defendants' favor is warranted for the reasons outlined in their prior letter. See ECF No. 236. Indeed, as the Court noted on September 24, "the Circuit has already dictated the opinion on extraterritoriality and corporate liability" in defendants' favor. Hr'g Tr. 16; see also Balintulo v. Daimler AG, 727 F.3d 174, 193 (2d Cir. 2013) (stating that the Supreme Court's decision in Kiobel v. Royal Dutch Petroleum Co., 133 S. Ct. 1659, 1669 (2013), "plainly forecloses the plaintiffs' claims as a matter of law" because all the relevant conduct in the case occurred abroad); id. at 191 n.26 (citing Kiobel v. Royal Dutch Petroleum Co., 621 F.3d 111, 149 (2d Cir. 2010)) (reiterating the law of the Second Circuit that "corporations are not proper defendants under the ATS in light of prevailing customary international law"). However, this Court explained at the September 24 conference that "it may be best to see what the Circuit does with the rehearing en banc". Hr'g Tr. 16.

Now that the Second Circuit has denied rehearing, and in light of this Court's statements at the September 24 conference, defendants respectfully submit that no further briefing is required, and that the Court should enter judgment in favor of defendants on the grounds that (i) the relevant conduct that plaintiffs allege occurred abroad, *Kiobel*, 133 S. Ct. at 1669; (ii) defendants are corporations and therefore not subject to ATS liability under the law of this Circuit, *Kiobel*, 621 F.3d at 149; and (iii) the complaints fail to allege facts satisfying the mens rea of aiding-and-abetting liability under the ATS, *Presbyterian Church of Sudan v. Talisman Energy, Inc.*, 582 F.3d 244, 259 (2d Cir. 2009). If, however, the Court believes that either a second pre-motion

conference or formal briefing is warranted, defendants are available for such a conference or request that the Court simply enter a briefing schedule for a Rule 12(c) motion for judgment on the pleadings.

Respectfully submitted,

Keith Hummel/mx

Keith R. Hummel

The Honorable Shira A. Scheindlin
United States District Judge
Southern District of New York
United States Courthouse
500 Pearl Street, Room 15C
New York, NY 10007-1316

BY ECF

Copies to:

Michael D. Hausfeld, Esq.
Hausfeld LLP
1700 K Street, NW
Suite 650
Washington, DC 20006

Paul L. Hoffman, Esq.
Schonbrun DeSimone Seplow Harris & Hoffman LLP
723 Ocean Front Walk
Venice, CA 90291

Jay Jacob Rice Nagel Rice, LLP 103 Eisenhower Parkway Roseland, NJ 07068

Judith Brown Chomsky
Law Office of Judith Brown Chomsky
P.O. Box 29726
Elkins Park, PA 19027

Tyler Giannini
International Human Rights Clinic
Harvard Law School
Pound Hall Room 401
1563 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138

Michael F. Osborne 56 Keerom Street Cape Town 08001 S. Af 558-7221

Linda P. Nussbaum
Kaplan Fox & Kilsheimer LLP (NYC)
850 Third Avenue
14th Floor
New York, NY 10022

Carroll H. Ingram
Ingram & Associates
P.O. Box 15039
Hattiesburg, MS 39404-5039

All Defense Counsel

BY ECF